To the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to FIGs. 3, 4A and

4B. The sheets replace the original sheets for FIGs. 3, 4A and 4B. More specifically, the

steps "S411" and "S409" of FIG. 3 are amended according to the paragraphs [0038,

0039]. Similarly, the steps "S507", "S509"and "S511" of FIG. 4A and steps "S519",

"S521"and "S523" of FIG. 4B are amended according to the paragraphs [0042, 0043]

respectively.

7

REMARKS

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because the Examiner believed that in paragraph [0037], an "M × N" representation of a matrix/array should be referred as that M represents the columns and N represents the rows, rather than the contrary defined by Applicants.

In response thereto, Applicants have amended paragraph [0037] of the specification.

Further, the Examiner pointed out that there is no mention of a flow chart to do the reading/sampling of the sensors cells as disclosed in Figure 2C.

Applicants have cancelled claims 9 and 18 from the claims. Therefore, the description of Fig. 2C is given for the purpose of illustrate an alternative distribution pattern, without constructing any basis of claim.

Objections to the specification are solicited to be withdrawn.

Drawings

The drawings are objected.

In response thereto, Applicants have submitted replacement drawings, in which all indicated informalities are corrected.

8

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st and 2nd paragraphs.

In response thereto, Applicants have cancelled claims 9 and 18, and therefore, the rejections made thereto are moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8, 10-14 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hiroshi Daiku et al. (US PG Pub. 2004/0017493; hereinafter Daiku).

In response thereto, Applicant hereby otherwise traverses these rejections. As such, Applicant submits that the present invention as set forth in claims 1-8, 10-14 and 19-20 is novel and unobvious over Daiku, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Regarding claim 10, which recites: "An apparatus for sensing an image, the apparatus comprising a plurality of image sensor cells being divided and grouped into a plurality of image cell groups, each of the image cell groups comprising a portion of said image sensor cells, wherein **an image sampling process is performed on all of the image cell groups as sampling units and image signals are sampled and generated therefrom.**" (Emphasis added).

In rejecting claim 10, addressing to the emphasized limitation, the Examiner contended: "The position of each pixel in the array or pixel matrix is expressed by coordinates ... the group of 4 pixels can be considered as the sampling unit. The readout is performed on all the image cells and the analog image signal generated by the each

9

pixel is converted into digital by an analog-digital (A/D) converter and outputted to a processing circuit".

It can be concluded from what had been admitted by the Examiner that the 4 pixel grouping is assumed by the Examiner while not practically taught by Daiku, and the pixel array could also be assumed to be grouped in many other ways without introducing any substantial difference from the Examiner assumed grouping, i.e., 4-pixel group. It can therefore be further concluded that if there is any, the alleged sampling process is not performed by taking the image cell groups as sampling units.

Moreover, in paragraph [0009] of Daiku, it states that "As shown schematically, through a lens 12, the image of an object 10 is projected on a single-plate-type color-image sensor 13, <u>each pixel of the single-plate-type color-image sensor 13 produces a pixel signal</u>, and <u>the pixel signals are read one by one</u>." In this manner, the pixels are sampled one by one in Daiku instead of being sampled as groups.

Therefore, Daiku, in fact, fails to teach "**an image sampling process performed on all of the image cell groups as sampling units and image signals are sampled and generated therefrom.**"

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Daiku does not anticipate claim 10, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 1 is rejected for the same reasoning of claim 10. Applicants submit that the foregoing reasons addressing to the patentability of claim 10 is also applicable to claim 1. Claims 1 and 10 are thus submitted to be novel and unobvious over See, and thus should

10

be allowed.

If independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2-8, 11-14 and 19-20 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claims 1 and 10. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Daiku* in further view of E. Gordon (US 5,061,036; hereinafter Gordon).

Applicants have cancelled claims 9 and 18, and therefore the rejections thereto are moot.

· 11

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13021-US-PA
Application No.: 10/711,672

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-8, 10-17, and 19-20 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

March 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
       Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

12